REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of February 14, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the three-month statutory period, no fee is believed due. The Office is expressly authorized, however, to charge any deficiency or credit any over-payment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 6-12, 13-14, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent 6,028,593 to Rosenburg, *et al.* (hereinafter Rosenburg). Claims 3-5 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenburg. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Rejections under §112

As previously stated, Claim 7 was rejected as being indefinite. In this reply, Claim 7 has been cancelled, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Amendments to the Claims to Overcome the Cited References

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 13 to further emphasize certain aspects of the claimed invention. In particular, claims 1, 10, and 13 now include the further limitation that a model of at least part of the human body is located at a receiving and a sending location. The model at the sending location incorporates sensors to detect an action of a first user at the first location. Claims 1, 10, and 13 also include the subject matter in Claims 2 and 14. In particular, they include the further limitation that the action detected is transmitted to a second location, where a second model incorporating sensors simulates the detected action on a second user. Claims 5, 9, 11-12, 15-17, and 20-21 have been amended to maintain consistency among the claims. New Claims 22-27 are also presented. Claims 2, 7, 8, 14, 18, and 19 have been cancelled. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification.

(See, e.g., Specification, [0023], [0025], [0026], and [0029]). No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Aspects Of The Invention

It may be useful at this juncture to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, exemplified by Claim 1, as amended, is a method of communicating physical human interactions over a communications network.

The method can include detecting physical contact of a first model incorporating one or more sensors by a first user located at a sending system, where the first model represents at least a portion of a human body. The method can also include generating data from the sensors and determining an action intended by the first user. The method can also include transmitting the determined action over a communications network to a receiving system, where the action is performed on a second user at the receiving system by a second model, which represents at least a portion of the human body, incorporating one or more actuators.

The Claims Define Over The Cited References

As already noted, independent Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Rosenburg, and Claims 10 and 13 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenburg. Applicants respectfully submit that Rosenburg, alone or in combination with any other reference of record, fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Rosenburg discloses a system and method for providing force feedback to a user operating a human/computer interface and interacting with a computer-generated simulation. (See Abstract.) Furthermore, on page 3 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Rosenburg discloses the subject matter in Claims 2 and 14. Applicants respectfully submit that Rosenburg fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious engaging in direct personal human interactions over the network, as recited in the claimed invention. Instead, Rosenburg only discloses engaging in indirect human interaction.

Rosenburg discloses interacting with other users in a computer simulation via a controller device configured to respond to respond to the simulated environment via one or more actuators in the controller device. (See, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-13). The controller device, as disclosed by Rosenburg, is configured to control movement and action of a user-manipulated object 34. User-manipulated objects 34, as disclosed by Rosenburg, include inanimate objects such as sporting equipment, tools, weapons, or vehicle controls being used in the simulation. (See, col. 6, lines 49-67).

However, Rosenburg fails to disclose that the user-manipulated object 34 can be a model of at least part of a human body. Nowhere does Rosenburg suggest or disclose directly manipulating a part of the human body of the remote user in the simulation. Although Rosenburg discloses the use of weapons or surgical tools which could impact a human body, such manipulation is indirect and one step removed from personal contact with a remote human body through the simulation.

In contrast, the claimed invention discloses directly interacting with another human body remotely. In particular, the sensors in the first model provide instructions for the second model to directly interact with the remote user to simulate the personal interaction. Therefore, rather than requiring that contact with another human body occur via the use of a user-manipulated object, separate from the body of the local user, the claimed invention allows the body of the remote user to be manipulated directly.

Rosenburg further fails to disclose or suggest simulating the actions of the local user directly on the remote user. In Rosenburg, when the force feedback response is provided, the controller of the remote user is configured to simulate the resulting forces due to the actions of the local user. For example in a fighting video game, when a user is "hit," the controller responds by vibrating or the like. Nowhere, though, does Rosenburg disclose or suggest simulating the action of the local user.

In contrast, the claimed invention, rather than simulating the resulting forces, simulates the action instead. Referring back to the example of a fighting video game, the

result in the claimed invention would not be simulating the resulting forces, instead the action of the local user would be simulation. For example, if the local user kicks the first model, the second model responds by simulating the kick on the remote user. Thus, in the claimed invention, the user actually experiences the action and the result, rather than just the result, as disclosed in Rosenburg.

Accordingly, Rosenburg, alone or in combination with any other reference of record, fails to expressly or inherently teach every feature recited in Claim 1. Likewise, Rosenburg fails to teach or suggest every feature recited in amended Claims 1, 10, and 17. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that the claims define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully assert that whereas the remaining claims each depend from one of Claims 1, 10, and 17 while reciting additional features, the dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **May 14, 2007**

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Eduardo J. Quiñones, Registration No. 58.575
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000